UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,883	02/20/2004	Joseph J. Kubler	14364US16	7739
23446 7590 07/14/2009 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400			EXAMINER	
			PEZZLO, JOHN	
CHICAGO, IL	60661		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/783,883	KUBLER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	John Pezzlo	2419		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 M 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 22-127 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 22-39 and 54-67 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 40-53, 68-127 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a composition and accomposition and accomposition is described as a contract to the second as a composition in the correct second as a compos	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2419

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

I. Claims 40-53, and 68-127 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,010 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because comparing claims 40, 68, 83, 98, and 113 of the application with claim 1, 3, 6, and 7 of the patent, both the application and the patent route calls over either the telephone circuit switch network or the Internet, and both the application and the patent provide a user interface which provides an Internet address to be used to route the call over the Internet.

The patent claims do not explicitly discloses a call setup request.

Art Unit: 2419

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art to provide the patent with a call setup request. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the patent provides a user interface to determine which network to utilize and it would be logical to provide a call setup request to initiate the call.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-39 and 54-68 are allowable over the prior art.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Sharma et al. (US 7,092,406 B2) discloses a computer implemented communication apparatus and method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Pezzlo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/783,883

Art Unit: 2419

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Page 4

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C.

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Jefferson Building

2A15

500 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA, 22313.

John Pezzlo

10 July 2009

/John Pezzlo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419